Autor: Asunción Villamil Touriño.
Título: "Review. Contini-Morava, E., R.S. Kirsner y B. Rodríguez-Bachiller (eds.) *Cognitive and Communicative Approaches to Linguistic Analysis*"
En THE LINGUIST LIST (http://linguistlist.org), http://linguistlist.org/issues/16/16-134.html. LINGUIST List: Vol-16-1588. Wed May 18 2005. Subject: 16.1588, Review: Ling Theories/Pragmatics: Contini-Morava *et al*.
Editor: LINGUIST LIST.
Fecha: 2005
ISSN: 1068 - 4875.

REVIEW

EDITORS: Contini-Morava, Ellen; Kirsner, Robert S.; Rodríguez-Bachiller, Betsy

TITLE: *Cognitive and Communicative Approaches to Linguistic Analysis*

SERIES: Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics 51

PUBLISHER: John Benjamins

YEAR: 2004

REVIEWER: Asunción Villamil Touriño, English Department, Escuela Oficial de Idiomas de Cuenca (Official Language School) (Spain)

This volume is a collection of papers which are the product of the Columbia School Linguistics Conference held at Rutgers University in October 1999. The book's main motivation is to present the dialogue between two linguistic schools, Columbia School (CS) and Cognitive Grammar (CG). The relationships between both are first sketched in the thorough introduction by Robert S. Kirsner (pp.1-18), which plunges the

reader into the book and raises interest on the contrasting and parallel views of CS and CG.

The first part of the book is devoted to Cognitive Grammar and includes two articles developed on the light shed by this current of analysis. The first one is "Form, meaning, and behavior: The Cognitive Grammar analysis of double subject constructions" (pp. 21-60), by Ronald W. Langacker. The introductory sections of the article constitute a presentation of CG, with a concise sketching of its most important concepts (trajectory, landmark, profiling, etc.) and basic tenets (continuum of syntax, morphology and lexicon or inherent meaning of grammatical markers and construction, among the most salient). The advantages of this line of analysis are persuasively presented through the analysis of double subject constructions in a wide range of languages. Then Langacker moves on to a detailed comparison between CS and CG, providing convincing answers to several criticisms made by CS, such as its dependence on some concepts of traditional grammar and its ambitious and perhaps unfeasible target of applying knowledge about cognition to analysis. The basic difference between both schools is revealed in their general approach to the possibility of language analysis, since CG takes a broad and inclusive view and CS narrows the scope of analysis due to the difficulties of linguistic research. Apart from this difference in the starting point, Langacker accepts the analysis proposed by CS in essence and offers the challenging view of considering CS to be included within the wider shade of CG.

The second article that takes CG as it framework is Michael B. Smith's "Cataphoric pronouns as mental space designators: Their conceptual import and discourse function" (pp. 61-90). This article provides some insight into the somewhat neglected cataphoric pronouns appearing in constructions such as "I despise it that John voted for the governor" by appealing to the notion of mental spaces as described by

Fauconnier and others. The study of examples from English, but also from German and Russian, leads the author to catalogue these pronouns as "mental space designators" inasmuch they designate and help the building up of mental spaces by anticipating the mental space that will be created by the subordinate clause following them. As CG maintains that grammatical markers are not arbitrary, but have a meaning, semantic motivations are searched for this use. The following are suggested: accentuation of conceptual distance, evocation of especial emphasis and accentuation of a space's physical boundaries. Compelling evidence from examples is given to support these claims.

Finishing with CG articles, the volume includes a second part dealing with theoretical issues in classical sign-based linguistics. One of the traditional assumptions of CS is the non-existence of polysemy, which is explored the article "Monosemy, homonymy and polysemy" (pp. 93-129) by Wallis Reid. The prepositions *at, in* and *on* are chosen for an exemplification of the reduction of traditionally polysemous signs to one single-meaning items. Each of them is postulated to have one single abstract meaning (similar to the schematic meanings suggested by CG) based on the number of dimensions that they conceptualize: *in* encompasses three dimensions in location, *on* more than zero and less than three, and *at* involves zero dimensions. Through the application of metaphor as described by cognitive grammarians, these meanings are transferred to the temporal sphere and to abstract domains. The abundant examples and discussions clarify the suitability of the meanings sketched and how they can account for the description of the three prepositions without resorting to polysemy. This article also illustrates some bridges of cooperation between CG and CS, such as the adoption of CG's view of metaphor.

The next chapter is devoted to the relationship between grammatical forms and their meanings (Mark J. Elson: "On the relationship between form and grammatical meaning in the linguistic sign", pp. 131-154). A detailed analysis of verb paradigms in some Slavic and Romance languages (Macedonian, Spanish, Polish, Romanian and Serbian) is the key to question the requirement of full grammatical representation in linguistics signs, by which all grammatical meanings are required to be represented even if there is just one desinence (*pormanteau* representation). After the compelling evidence from the analysis (although some of it is not clear enough, as for example the source for dialectal Spanish – what kind of dialectal Spanish is that? Mexican? Colombian? Peninsular?), some verbal desinences in the languages under observation are shown to convey less than the total grammatical meaning associated with the words in which they occur. Three paradigms are recognized for analytic purposes: a formation paradigm, a sub-paradigm and a minimal sub-paradigm. Verbal forms are assumed to have internal paradigmatic structure and the contrast with the rest of the paradigm appears as a strong motivation for the choice of the grammatical meaning which will be represented. Priorities for different meanings are suggested for each kind of paradigm level. Lastly, all these data support the view of the morpheme as a linguistic unit and open the room for the possibility of full grammatical representation not to be the necessary case, but probably the optimal (prototypical?) kind of representation. As the previous article, this chapter also displays some links with CG, as the use of the concept of iconicity or the assumption that language is formed by form-meaning pairings.

The article by Joseph Davis "Revisiting the gap between meaning and message" (pp.155-174) focuses on a traditional issue within CS, the difference between the (limited) linguistic meanings encoded in signs and the rich communicative messages inferred from these meanings. The relation between both was bridged by the term

"strategy", but this appears unsatisfying at the light of the evidence listed by Davis. This evidence concerns four aspects: compatible meanings, categorical strategies, correlation and causation, and independence of textual elements. In the first place, CS assumes that logically incompatible meanings do not occur or at least do so very rarely, which is not the case, as in "*a* (singular) *crossroads* (plural)". As to the second aspect, evidence from studies in Italian, French and Spanish clitics suggests that strategies are not categorical, in the sense that they are not psychological realities, but only theoretical conveniences. Thirdly, some CS studies have simplified matters accepting that correlation implies causation; again, evidence from pronouns *le / la /lo* in Spanish leads us to the contrary conclusion. This is related to the last criticism presented: explanatory factors are not independent and the interconnections between them could advisably be taken into account. The enriching arguments against the misuse of the term "strategy" conclude with the sound advice of carrying out deeper analyses and a constant re-evaluation of hypotheses and results.

Whereas the articles so far have dealt with theoretical issues of both CS and CG, the subsequent chapters ("Part III. Analyses on the level of the classic linguistic sign") are devoted to practical analysis of grammatical structures that follow the guidelines set by CS. These papers share a common structure: (1) they present a problematic grammatical item that has been insufficiently studied; (2) a single meaning is postulated to account for all its uses; (3) the hypothesized meaning is checked with corpora. Although not explicitly stated, the pedagogical implications of the results of the analysis are indisputable. The first signs studied are the German conjunctions *als* and *wenn* ("The givenness of background: A semantic-pragmatic study of two modern German subordinating conjunctions", by Zhuo Jing-Schmidt, pp. 177-203). These items are traditionally differentiated in terms of the temporal (past, present or future times) and

modal (factual vs. non-factual) meanings of the subordinate clause they introduce. Jing-Schmidt shows the flaws of this approach and proposes that the speaker gives instructions to the hearer as to how he has to interpret the following information: while *als* suggests that the background is given, *wenn* tells the reader that the background is not given and the speaker provides an imaginary or hypothetical situation as background. The hypothesis is validated through examples and the explanatory power of these meanings is displayed against traditional and pedagogical approaches.

The next phenomenon under investigation is Spanish subjunctive (Bob de Jonge: "The relevance of relevance in linguistic analysis: Spanish subjunctive mood", pp. 205-218"). The search for a unitary account of the distribution of indicative and subjunctive mood is the target of the paper. Previous descriptions used a variety of explanatory factors, such as assertiveness vs. non-assertiveness. The hypothesis is that indicative mood expresses assertion of the occurrence expressed by the verb but subjunctive mood does not associate with non-assertion, but with the expression of an alternative. These meanings are applied to analyse quantitatively and qualitatively subordinate *que*-clauses from some of García Marquez's short stories. Although limited in its scope, the hypothesis seems to work here. As suggested by the author, future studies will have to test its validity for a wider variety of contexts.

The following chapter ("A sign-based analysis of English pronouns in conjoined expressions", by Nancy Stern, pp. 219-234) highlights the use of *self*-pronouns in conjoined expressions such as "According to John, the article was written by Ann and himself" (2004:219). Many native speakers feel insecure in the use of pronouns in these expressions owing to the confusion between object and subject pronouns. The use of *self*-pronouns to avoid the choice between them seems to add extra uncertainty. As well as the misapplication of prescriptive rules, the distribution of these pronouns seems to

be anchored on the meaning of “insistence on an entity”, added to the person, number and sex meanings. This meaning is taken as the key to illuminate examples taken from different contemporary best-sellers. Other factors linked to the description are the Control System among participants in the event or differentiation of reference. Together with prescriptivism, the article insists on the fact the distribution of these pronouns is determined by a combination of causes.

Noah Oron and Yishai Tobin’s contribution is the first to leave Indoeuropean languages and targets at exploring the complexities of the Hebrew verbs (“Semantic oppositions in the Hebrew verb system”, pp. 235-260). The patterns that comprise the verb system have been previously accounted for by resorting to a somewhat random combination of syntactic, pragmatic and semantic functions, but a sign-oriented explanation results in a far more convincing description. Each of the eight / seven verbal inflectional and conjugational patterns is described according to a set of invariant meanings based on three domains (Objective vs. Subjective, Single vs. Multiple, and Autonomy). The paper applies these meanings to one of these verbal alternations (PAAL-HYTPAEL) showing how these general meanings, as well as the paradigmatic contrast between the different alternations, is the motivating force behind the different distributions. The generalizations previously made seem to success in the description of all 150 PAAL-HYPTAEL alternations and the application of these invariant meanings to different types of verbs classified according to semantic features.

A pair of morphemes from Hualapai, a language spoken in Arizona, is surveyed in Kumiko Ichihashi-Nakayama’s article (“Grammaticization of 'to' and 'away': A unified account of *–k* and *–m* in Hualapai”, pp. 261-273). Some formerly suggested functions are reviewed in the first place to move on to a unitary proposal for one single meaning for morphemes *–k* and *-m*: ‘inside/toward the “focal point”’ and ‘outside/away

from the “focal point”’, respectively. The different readings of these suffixes are argued not to be distinct meanings, but different manifestations of these root meanings adapted to the context where they appear, namely, as noun or verb suffixes, at the end of sentences or combining clauses. Furthermore, there are different hints of these morphemes’ movement towards grammaticalization, although the lack of diachronic data prevents more conclusive statements.

Classical sign-based studies give way now to the fourth section of the volume which moves away from the sign level (“Part IV. Below and above the level of the sign”). The focus now shifts from grammar to the application of CS theory to phonology, lexicon and discourse. Shabana Hameed addresses the issue of phonology in her article “Interaction of physiology and communication in the make-up and distribution of stops in Lucknow Urdu” (pp. 277-288). CS framework is used in this case to explain the inventory of stop phonemes in Urdu and their distribution in words in terms of physiology and communication. Five native informants were chosen to collect a collection of monosyllabic words to serve as corpus. The first step is to present the consonants of the language in several tables according to a categorization based on the organs of articulation and demonstrated through minimal pairs. The classification contrasts with traditional taxonomies based on passive points of articulation in that it is physiologically based on the articulators that play a significant role in shaping and exciting the vocal cavity for the production of speech sounds. The result is the selection five articulators: labium, apex, medium, front dorsum and post dorsum. The aim of the next section is to establish a hierarchy of adroitness of the articulators, since it is postulated that they are not uniform in terms of their adroitness. This hierarchy stems from the relationship of articulators and the inventory and distribution of stop consonants; that is, the most adroit articulator will be most productively used in the

production of consonants. Quantitative frequency measurements support this claim. The following step is to compare the sounds in initial and final position. Taking as a starting point that the beginning of a word carries a greater communicative load, it is expected that there will be an increase of frequency of more favoured stops at the beginning of the word and, conversely, less favoured articulators will appear at the end of the word. These contrasts demonstrate the interaction of physiology and communication.

The interconnection between phonology and lexicon is the target of Yishai Tobin's "Between phonology and lexicon: The Hebrew triconsonantal (CCC) root system revolving around /r/ (C-r-C)" (pp. 289-323). The paper postulates a general meaning ("a change in structure") for the roots containing /r/ in Hebrew. This general meaning is shown to be present in other phonologically related roots, which express semantic subfields that can be considered to be included within this general meaning (either through literal or metaphoric connections). Cognitive limitations and the principle of "economy of effort" are interestingly used to explain the motivation of this phenomenon. An exhaustive list of all the roots containing /r/ is presented to back up the hypothesis. It is remarkable that this article is a first step on the part of the author to search for other connections between phonology and semantic fields in Hebrew.

Now is the turn of discourse and word order is the next level under investigation. Ricardo Otheguy, Betsy Rodríguez-Bachiller and Eulalia Canals ("Length of the extra-information phrase as a predictor of word order: A cross-language comparison", pp. 325-340) draw from CS tenets to account for some word order variations exclusively in terms of signs and meanings, without resort to other syntactic constructs. They focus on the orders of the Event, extra information about the Event and the second Participant and their interaction with the length of the expression. Their predictions (shorter elements will come out earlier) are put to the statistical test of a corpus of English and

Spanish texts, including translations. Some of the initial hypotheses succeed: English shows a tendency to place extra information and lower Participants at the end of the sentence and the longer element at the end, while Spanish situates extra information more freely. But surprisingly, differences between English and Spanish seem to be a matter of degree, in that similar word order effects were discovered in both languages, although they showed a different magnitude in each language (Spanish exhibits more tolerance to intervening extra information).

Word order is again an issue in "Word-order variation in spoken Spanish in constructions with a verb, a direct object, and an adverb: The interaction of syntactic, cognitive, pragmatic, and prosodic features" by Francisco Ocampo (Pp. 341-360). However, this time only Spanish is the object of analysis and the scope is narrowed to objects and adverbs. A corpus of informal conversations is examined according to factors such as topicality, status of the referent and adverb type among others. The article highlights the interactions of these factors and word order when the pragmatic function of the sentence is to convey information and when it has an additional pragmatic function. The results, which are schematized in a table and clearly exemplified, demonstrate the correlation between word order and the cognitive and syntactic factors mentioned when only information is conveyed; in this case unmarked orders are used, but alterations make way when additional pragmatic functions come into play.

The last article by Anita Martinez ("Estrategias discursivas como parámetros para el análisis lingüístico", pp. 361-379) concentrates on the alternation of the accusative pronouns *le / lo* in the northwest of Argentina. In contrast to standard Argentinian or the peninsular variety of Spanish, this variability is not to be due to "leísmo", but to the substrate of Guaraní and Quechua. The transfer and identification

between a Quechua suffix and *le* condition the strategies for its use. It is argued that in narratives the use of *le* correlates with a heightening of suspense, since the use of *le*, with a more active meaning than *lo*, alerts the listener that the second participant will play a more powerful role than expected. This device is skilfully exploited in oral narratives, as the analysis of the corpora and control experiments reveal.

After summarizing the main points of the papers of which the volume consists, let us now turn to some concluding evaluative remarks. Firstly, the significance of this compilation is undeniable for analysts within the linguistic schools represented in the papers; the book displays with precision that it does not exist such a great distance between them. CS makes use of some of CG tenets, and CG, as Langacker says, can profit from CS analysis (2004: 56). CS papers make constant use of CG terms, such as iconicity, metaphor, etc. and more basically, they share the assumption that grammar has a meaning.

Not only does this volume cater for such a limited audience, but it will also prove to be of great interest for any scholar with an interest in grammatical analysis, even if not directly interested in CS or CG. The relevant empirical data alongside the exhaustive qualitative and quantitative analysis carried out in the papers, especially in part three and four, provide solid ground for the hypotheses postulated, which are nevertheless open to future extensions and modifications, as generally stated on the papers themselves. This need for constant reevaluation is addressed by accurate criticisms to other currents or authors or even to the school to which the author belongs (cf. Davis 2004:155-174) and consequently answering of criticisms from others (cf. Langacker 2004: 21-60). The new revealing argumentations are perhaps the most enriching contribution of the book. Even if it does not provide all the answers, it raises many enlightening questions as to the status of linguistics as a science and the insights

of linguistic analysis. The clear structure of the volume in general and all the papers in particular, as well as the study of a great variety of languages (English, German, Guarani, Hebrew, Hualapai, Macedonian, Spanish, Urdu, etc.) also contribute to the merits of the book.

On possible drawback is the lack of balance between papers from CG and CS; of course it should be born in mind that these papers are the product of a CS conference. In spite of that, after the introduction and Langacker's article, in which the most relevant contact lines between the schools are articulated, the reader might miss more information with reference to a further dialogue between both currents.

All things considered, this work represents a valuable and up-to-date contribution to linguistic analysis, especially grammatical, and constitutes a thought-provoking basis for further studies on the field.

ABOUT THE REVIEWER

Asunción Villamil is currently working a full-time teacher of English as a foreign language in an Escuela Oficial de Idiomas (Spanish state language school), and combines her teaching activities with academic research. She is a PhD student at the English Philology Department of the Complutense University of Madrid and her doctoral research focuses on comparative syntax from a cognitive point of view. She has published articles on verbal complementation, metaphor and teaching English as a foreign language.